

REMARKS**I. Introduction**

At the time of the Office Action dated April 21, 2006, claims 1-15 were pending. Of those claims, claims 2, 4, 6-9, 12 and 14 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.142(b). Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 5 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 3, 10, 11 and 15 stand rejected.

In this Amendment, claims 1 and 13 have been amended, claim 5 has been canceled and new claims 16-18 have been added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitations recited in allowable claim 5. Allowable claim 13 has also been amended to be in independent form based on claim 1. New claims 16-18 corresponds to original claims 3, 10 and 11, respectively, but are dependent on claim 13 which includes all the limitations recited in original claim 1. Therefore, the present Amendment does not generate any new matter or any new issue for that matter. Accordingly, entry of the present Amendment is solicited pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Now, claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 16-18 are active in this application.

II. The Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 10, 11 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pradhan.¹ The Examiner maintained his position on the rejection of claims 1, 3, 10 and 11, and rejected previously added claim 15.

¹ The Office Action states that claims 1, 3, 10-11 and 14 are rejected. Because claim 14 has been withdrawn from consideration, Applicants presume that the Examiner intended to reject claim 15.

Applicants first note that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 have been rendered moot by amendment of claim 1 to include all the limitations recited in allowable claim 5.

Applicants also submit that Pradhan does not disclose a receiver circuit including all the limitations recited in independent claim 15. Specifically, Pradhan does not disclose, at minimum, “the input terminal having a terminating resistor but not having pull-up and pull-down resistors,” recited in claim 15. The present invention does not have a series circuit including a pull-up resistor, a terminating resistor and a pull-down resistor between a power source and ground, thereby preventing flow-through current from the power source to the ground through the three resistors to reduce power consumption.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that resistors 300 in Fig. 3 of Pradhan are neither pull-up nor pull-down resistors. Applicants understand resistors 300 to be terminal resistors, and not to be pull-up or pull-down resistors. However, Applicants stress that Pradhan in Fig. 3 explicitly discloses a circuit including pull-up and pull-down resistors, in addition to terminal resistors 300.

Fig. 3 of Pradhan shows resistor network 302 connected to input terminals INP and INM. The resistor network is necessary for operation of “loss of signal” detector 306. Resistor network 302 comprises a resistor of 500 K Ω to which power supply voltage V1 is supplied and which is connected to input terminal INP, a resistor of 500 K Ω which is grounded and connected to input terminal INM, and two resistors of 100 K Ω which generate voltage VMID, one half of the supply voltage V1. See, column 3, line 37 through column 4, line 24.

In resistor network 302, the resistor to which supply voltage V1 is supplied is a pull-up resistor, and the resistor grounded is a pull-down resistor. Moreover, Fig. 3 of Pradhan shows termination resistors 300. Thus, Pradhan discloses a circuit including termination resistors 300,

the pull-up resistor and the pull-down resistor. Because Pradhan's circuit includes those resistors, flow-through current from supply voltage V1 is constantly supplied to the ground through resistor network 302 including the pull-up and pull-down resistors. In contrast, the claimed invention includes the input terminal having a terminating resistor but not having pull-up and pull-down resistors.

Accordingly, Pradhan does not disclose a receiver circuit including all the limitations recited in claim 15 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 and favorable consideration thereof.

III. New Claims 16-18

New claims 16-18 are patentable over the prior art references of record at least because they respectively include all the limitations recited in allowable claim 13. Applicants solicit favorable consideration thereof.

IV. Conclusion

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

10/716,615

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TT
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 21, 2006

WDC99 1258863-1.060188.0713